

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 were pending and rejected. In this response, claims 1, 7, and 10 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise, and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. As indicated above, claim 17 has been added. In this response, no new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Publication US 2004/0257369A1 of Fang (hereinafter “Fang”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. An system, comprising:
a processor;
a memory controller hub coupled to the processor;
a graphics controller coupled to the memory controller hub;
a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application;
a plurality of video frame buffers, the video frame buffer to receive input from a plurality of tuners;
a blending and display unit to receive input from the plurality of video frame buffers and the memory controller hub; and
a plurality of video output units coupled to the blending and display unit. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 requires “a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application”. Fang fails to disclose at least this limitation.

Fang discloses blending video data with graphics data and outputting video frames comprising blended video and graphics (Fang, paragraph 0008, lines 1-3). Fang describes using a second frame buffer (150) to store blended result of the first video frame buffer (Fang, paragraph 0014, lines 1-4, figure 1). Fang also shows using four graphic processors in a graphic card (Fang, paragraph 0020, lines 1-4, figure 3) to serve different video displays. As shown in figure 1 of Fang, each graphics processor is coupled to one single frame buffer (150) where all data are stored in the single frame buffer (Fang, paragraph 0018, lines 13-15). Fang does not describe a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to a graphic controller.

Applicant submits that Fang fails to disclose “a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application” as required in claim 1. In view of this reason, Applicant believes that claim 1 is not anticipated by Fang. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections for claim 1.

Claim 10, as amended, recites:

10. A method, comprising:
associating, by a graphics controller, each of a plurality of graphics frame buffers with a corresponding one of a plurality of players of a game application;
storing images for the viewing perspective of each player in the associated graphics frame buffers; and
outputting the images associated with each player to a separate display. (emphasis added)

Claim 10 requires “associating, by a graphics controller, each of a plurality of graphics frame buffers with a corresponding one of a plurality of players of a game application”. Fang shows that each graphics processor is coupled to one single frame buffer (150) where all data are stored in the single frame buffer (Fang, paragraph 0018, lines 13-15). As described above,

Fang fails to disclose at least the limitation as recited above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claim 10 is not anticipated.

Applicant believes that claim 10 is allowable such that claims 11 depending therefrom with additional limitation is also allowable. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections for the claims 10-11.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6 and claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang, US 2004/0257369A1 (hereinafter “Fang”) in view of Grapes, US 6,446,130 B1 (hereinafter “Grapes”).

Claims 2-6 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 as amended. Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicant respectfully submits that Fang and Grapes fail to disclose all the limitations of claims 2-6. Fang fails to disclose “a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application” as required in claim 1. The detailed remarks with respect to independent claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Grapes does not overcome these deficiencies. Grapes shows a multimedia delivery computer that converts discrete video, left audio, and right audio signals into a modulated RF signal. The video and audio content is converted by means of a series of converters which decompress or otherwise process the digital audio and video content and convert the digital data to analog signals (Grapes, column 5, lines 52-56). There is no description about a graphics controller or graphics frame buffers in Grapes. Therefore, Fang and Grapes fail to disclose “a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each

graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application” as required in claim 1.

At least for the foregoing reason, Applicant believes that claims 2-6 depending from claim 1 are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection for the claims 2-6.

Claims 12-16 depend directly or indirectly from claim 10. Applicant respectfully submits that Fang and Grapes fail to disclose “associating, by a graphics controller, each of a plurality of graphics frame buffers with a corresponding one of a plurality of players of a game application” as required in claim 10. Therefore, for the same reasons given above, Applicant believes that claims 12-16 are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections for the claims 12-16.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang, US 2004/0257369A1 (hereinafter “Fang”) in view of Grapes, US 6,446,130 B1 (hereinafter “Grapes”) and further in view of Elliott, US 2002/0077177 A1 (hereinafter “Elliott”).

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicant respectfully submits that Fang, Grapes, and Elliott fail to disclose the teaching as required in claims 7-9. Claims 7-9 depend indirectly from claim 1.

Elliott discloses a modification to existing video game system to incorporate security control functions. There is also no description about a graphics controller or graphics frame buffers in Elliott. Applicant submits that Fang, Grapes, and Elliott fail to disclose “a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application” as required in claim 1. The detailed remarks with respect to claims 2-6 are incorporated herein by reference.

Applicant believes that claims 7-9 are patentable and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections for the claims 7-9.

New Claims

Applicant presents a new claim 17 depending from claim 1. Applicant would like to submit that claim 1 is patentable and therefore claim 17 depending from claim 1 is also allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 7/21/08

Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300